

In the Dark Season Two: Q&A Update

Madeleine Baran: Hi guys. This is Madeleine Baran, host of In the Dark. And I'm here with our Senior Producer, Samara Freemark.

Samara Freemark: Hi guys! We are back with another update episode of Season 2 of In the Dark. And in this episode we're going to do something a little bit different than we usually do, we're going to be taking questions from all of *you*. You guys have sent us questions on Facebook and Twitter and email, some of you have even left voicemails for us. And we're really excited to get to your questions. We're gonna do that in just a few minutes.

Madeleine Baran: But first, I wanted to tell you about my latest trip to Winona. I was there last month with our producer Natalie. And we found out something while we were there that we thought you might want to know.

Every time we're in Winona we're invited to Sunday services at Winona Baptist Church. It's the oldest black church in town, and it's also this community hub. Lots of people go there

Pastor Mark Williamson: Good morning to everyone. It's good to be here, and we are grateful to God for all of you being here today

(church choir singing)

So, this last time we were there, after the service ended, a woman came up to Natalie and told her something.

I didn't catch what it was, so when Natalie and I got back into the car, she filled me in.

Madeleine Baran: Okay. you said you had something to tell me.

Natalie Jablonski: Yeah, I'm gonna tell you this just in case this is true.

Madeleine Baran: Okay.

Natalie Jablonski: This woman after church - she wouldn't tell me her name - she said that Nelson Forrest's house burned down a couple days after the funeral.

Madeleine Baran: What? No.

Nelson Forrest is the pastor who gave the eulogy at the funeral of Curtis' mother Lola in July, the eulogy where Pastor Forrest told people in Winona to put aside their fear, and stand up for Curtis Flowers.

Nelson Forrest: Sick and tired of scared folks. Jesus didn't die on no cross for you to be scared. He wasn't scared. What are you scared of? You stand for what's right. So, when they ask you (fades out)

Madeleine Baran: Nelson Forrest's house burned down after the funeral?

Natalie Jablonski: I mean, we could just drive by his house right now.

Madeleine Baran: Yeah, let's just drive by.

(driving)

Madeleine Baran: Did she say anything else?

Natalie Jablonski: She was like I don't want to get mixed up in it because I don't want my house to burn down. And she wouldn't tell me her name.

(driving, blinker sound)

Nelson Forrest's house is on a quiet cul-de-sac with one-story houses close together.

Madeleine Baran: Check that out.

Natalie Jablonski: What??

Madeleine Baran: Is that his house right there?

Natalie Jablonski: Yep

Madeleine Baran: That house has burned. The roof is partially gone, and the door is boarded up, and the screen on the door, the door's wide open.

Natalie Jablonski: Oh my god.

Madeleine Baran: Yeah

Natalie Jablonski: There's like a tarp, a blue tarp over part of the roof because the roof, there's like holes in the roof, you can see the beams underneath.

Madeleine Baran: There's a car in the driveway, should we go up?

Natalie Jablonski: I guess so

Madeleine Baran: I think so too, let me loop around, that this is terrible.

(getting out of car)

(walking up to house)

(knocking on door)

While I was knocking on the door, Nelson Forrest's wife Maggie Forrest and some of her family came around the side of the house

Madeleine Baran: Hello?

Maggie Forrest: Woo! Excuse me!

Madeleine Baran: Oh I'm sorry, did I scare you?

Madeleine Baran: I'm so sorry!

Mrs. Forrest had come back to the house to try and salvage a few last things.

Maggie Forrest: How you all doing?

Madeleine Baran: Okay - what happened?

Maggie Forrest: House burned
Natalie Jablonski: When?
Maggie Forrest: July the 25th.

July 25th. That was just four days after her husband, Pastor Forrest, gave the eulogy at Lola Flowers' funeral.

Maggie Forrest: So, we're just taking pictures of it, they're supposed to tear it down tomorrow. So, we're just getting our last - we don't know, the fire marshals say they can't see where it started, or what happened.
Madeleine Baran: Was anyone home when it happened?
Maggie Forrest: My husband, he just barely got out.
Madeleine Baran: Nelson Forrest was home.
Natalie Jablonski: Wow.

Mrs. Forrest told me that her husband was in bed sleeping when he heard a loud sound. At first it sounded like maybe someone was trying to break in.

Maggie Forrest: And by the time he got up, the smoke detector went off, and he could see the blaze coming out of that window. He got out and it was just rolling all around the house. He came out in his pants, somebody gave him shoes and a shirt, one of the neighbors.

Mrs. Forrest was at her mother's house that night.

Maggie Forrest: he called about 11 o'clock he said girl the house on fire. I said no, quit playing. He said the house on fire, he said, and I just barely got out. Car burned, truck burned. And, uh, came home and it was destroyed. So, it was totaled, and nobody know what happened. And, everybody, some people asking, somebody set your house on fire? We don't know. We don't know what happened, and the fire marshal doesn't seem to know, the investigator they don't seem to know either.
Madeleine Baran: They don't have any cause.
Maggie Forrest: Have any what now?
Madeleine Baran: They haven't determined—?
Maggie Forrest: They didn't determine it.
Madeleine Baran: Can we see inside?
Maggie Forrest: Sure! Where the key go, I just locked it up, where are the keys
Maggie Forrest: Ya'll be careful, it's glass. I'm looking to turn on the light, but there's no light to turn on
Natalie Jablonski: Oh wow.
Madeleine Baran: We're walking through glass and soot and wow.
Maggie Forrest: And this is the kitchen. And see, so that was burned too, right across. You can tell that.
Natalie Jablonski: Wow.

Madeleine Baran: So the roof was burned.

Maggie Forrest: That's what I'm saying, it was the roofs the roof on both sides.

Madeleine Baran: Were you able to what was saved?

Maggie Forrest: Well we got some clothes out. All our computer stuff that was over there, of course gone.

Mrs. Forrest told me that fortunately she and her husband had fire insurance, but still.

Natalie Jablonski: I'm so sorry.

Maggie Forrest: Well thank you all so much. Like I said we've been in this house 36 years, 36 or 37. And we never imagined a fire. I mean you know, we been just fine, nothing happened, but and you just feel like, part of you gone. I mean this was our memories, this was our stuff. I know it was paid for, bought and paid for. For it to go, you have to start all over again. It's kinda bad, but everything else, I mean we're glad that his life was spared. Because it could be a totally different story. Mm hmm.

Madeleine Baran: I do wonder if, because he's been so outspoken.

Maggie Forrest: That's what a lot of people say. But we don't know.

Madeleine Baran: I'm so sorry, this is terrible.

Maggie Forrest: Thank you, thank you. Yep.

Madeleine Baran: Do you think it's gonna change anything about your husband's outspokenness?

Maggie Forrest: No! I mean no, he's always been that way. No, mm-mm.

Music starts

The initial report from the Winona Fire Department said the cause of the fire was unknown. We checked in with the fire chief of Winona. His name is Brad Mooneyham, and he told us they did not investigate the fire, and also that they did not call in the state fire marshal to investigate. He wouldn't say why. He also told us that he did not think the fire was suspicious, but he wouldn't explain that either

The Forrests are staying with family for now, but Mrs. Forrest told us they're going to rebuild right here in this same spot.

Music

Samara Freemark: So now let's get to your questions. This is Samara again, I'm the Senior Producer of In the Dark. and I'm sitting in the studio with Madeleine. And Madeleine, let's start with the big news in the case, which is that the supreme court just granted cert to Curtis Flowers. And we've gotten a lot of questions from listeners asking what exactly is going to happen now.

Madeleine Baran: Right so this is the big news that the U.S. Supreme Court will hear Curtis Flowers' appeal. And so, the process, the way the process works, is that in the next couple of

months, both sides will be submitting written briefs to the Supreme Court. And then the Court will schedule oral arguments. So that's when both sides will actually appear before the nine justices in D.C. And they'll each have 30 minutes to make their case. After that, after that oral argument, the justices will deliberate. They'll decide privately whether they want to overturn his conviction. And they'll announce their decision. And the Court's term ends in June 2019. So, this case, whether his conviction is overturned or not, will be decided by the end of that term. So sometime between now and late June.

Samara Freemark: And what exactly is the Supreme Court looking at, like what is the question that they're considering in Curtis' case?

Madeleine Baran: So, they're not opening up the whole case. This isn't a question of, is Curtis Flowers guilty of these crimes or not? The U.S. Supreme Court is looking at this really narrow part of the case, which has to do with jury selection. So, we've reported a lot on jury selection, and what the Court is looking at is whether the district attorney Doug Evans discriminated against black people in jury selection. Whether he struck black people from the jury in Curtis' sixth trial, because of their race. So that's the question that the Court will be looking at.

Samara Freemark: SF: So what happens if Curtis wins in court? So, if the Supreme Court does overturn his conviction. Does he get out of prison?

Madeleine Baran: Not necessarily. So this is the question a lot of people have been asking us-- if the U.S. Supreme Court overturns his conviction, he's free right? And the answer is not necessarily. He actually will remain incarcerated while the next step happens. And in Curtis' case, what will happen is the District Attorney Doug Evans will be able to decide what he wants to do next. He's got three main options. Number one, Doug Evans could dismiss the charges, just drop it. And if he did that, then Curtis would be released from prison. Number two, he could offer Curtis a plea deal, and that is something you do sometimes see in these cases of alleged wrongful conviction, where in an effort to try to resolve this, a plea deal is reached. There's even a very particular kind of plea deal, which is I think worth pointing out, where you can technically plead guilty, but maintain your innocence. Essentially what you're doing is saying, look I'm acknowledging that if I went to trial, there's enough evidence to convict me, but I'm not saying that I did this crime. That's actually, it's called an Alford plea. And so, anyway, there's a variety of options of different plea deals that could be offered. Then of course, if he doesn't dismiss it, or offer a plea deal, the other option is another trial. Which would be --.

Samara Freemark: Trial 7.

Madeleine Baran: Exactly, a 7th trial. So, it's really up to him. So, it'll be interesting to see how he ends up, what decision he'll end up making. And in any other case you might say, well, I don't know, will he try it again? But this is an extraordinary case. There's already been six trials. And so, it's very possible there could be seven. So, it really is up to him. This is the question we keep getting asked, is it really still his decision to make? Even if the U.S. Supreme court were to overturn his conviction and find that Doug Evans committed prosecutorial misconduct.

Samara Freemark: Which has been found by multiple courts before.

Madeleine Baran: Yeah. Even if the highest court in the country finds that he discriminated against black people in jury selection, Doug Evans still gets to be the one to decide. So that really is at the heart of why Curtis Flowers has been tried so many times to begin with. That has not changed. So it will be the exact same situation if the court overturns it again.

Samara Freemark: And so do you have any sense of what goes into that decision by Doug Evans? If the Supreme Court rules for Curtis, if it comes to Doug Evans and he has to decide what he's gonna do? What does that process look like?

Madeleine Baran: Typically, what prosecutors will do in a situation like this is they'll weigh the evidence. They'll look at all the evidence and they'll make a decision. Do I have enough evidence to convince a jury of this? Do I have enough evidence even for me to still believe this person is guilty? So that's the sort of decisions that a prosecutor will make. Of course, Doug Evans hasn't talked to us about his strategy, so we don't know exactly what it will be. But one of the things we would expect to see in a case like this is a presentation of the evidence by the defense. An attempt to say look, you don't want to bring this to a seventh trial because you'll lose. Or, are you sure you have the right person, cause let's look at this stuff? So, some of the things that could come up there would be, for example, the fact that Odell Hallmon, the state's star witness, has reversed himself, and said I lied when I said Curtis confessed to me. Or it could have to do with alternate suspects, or problems with the ballistics evidence. And so, this is part of this back and forth negotiation. Like look, you know, I think your case is pretty weak, or no I'm pretty certain it's quite solid. This kind of give and take where both sides are trying to get to a place where they can feel good about it. And you know, this is a very difficult moment in a lot of cases, of alleged wrongful conviction. Because you have, on the one hand, you have someone who says I'm innocent. On the other hand, you have the prosecutor who has committed a lot of time, and certainly in the case of Doug Evans, more than twenty years, to prosecuting this person. And so often yet, even though there's that kind of polarization, we often do see a deal being reached. Of course, in this case, who knows.

Samara Freemark: So everything we just talked about has to do with if the court reverses Curtis' conviction. So of course, there's another possibility. So what happens if the court upholds the conviction, if they say the state of Mississippi did not get this wrong, Doug Evans didn't get this wrong, the conviction stands?

Madeleine Baran: That is definitely of course not a good outcome for Curtis. So, if that happened, the state would be validated. They'd say look we were right, we did not commit racial discrimination in jury selection. So, it would be a validation of the state. And it would mean that Curtis Flowers would of course remain on death row. He does have other options, one other main option in his appeal, and it's something called a postconviction. A post-conviction is the process by which you can introduce new evidence that wasn't known at the time of trial. So what Curtis and his lawyers would be doing is saying, yes Curtis was convicted in the sixth trial,

but since that trial happened, there's a whole lot of new information that's come to light that we think should've been known at the time of that trial, because we think it could've made a difference. And then that post-conviction process will make its way through the courts. And it is very long. It can take years and years.

Samara Freemark: and this is something that the In the Dark team is gonna continue covering. We will be covering as Curtis' case as it goes through the Supreme Court, and after.

Madeleine Baran: Right. And We're actually in the process right now of putting together a plan for what that looks like, and we're really excited about what we're going to be able to do, so please stay tuned for that, sometime in early 2019.

Samara Freemark: Keep us in your feeds. You can also sign up to get email updates. So, if you go to our website, inthedarkpodcast-dot-org, you can sign up to get email updates about the case.

Madeleine Baran: Those email updates, that will be, those emails will be the fastest way to find out breaking news in the case. So, for example, if the U.S. Supreme court upheld his conviction, or overturned it, we will immediately send out an email alert to our subscribers, telling them that. And we will also very quickly update the podcast. So i would definitely, if you want the latest you really should subscribe to that email list.

Samara Freemark: Yep. All right we will get to some more of your questions after the break.

BREAK

***Caller:** Hi. I was wondering how common is it to find a case like Curtis's where the D.A. has tried the defendant several times for the same crime. I was wondering if you guys know of any other cases where this has happened. Thank you.*

***Caller:** Hi, my name is Karen Dover and I was just wondering, how many times can you actually try the same person for the same crime, and is there any limitations? Thank you, bye bye.*

Madeleine Baran: Yeah, that was definitely one of our —. Both of those questions were some of the first questions we had. So to answer the first question, we spent a lot of time trying to find anyone who'd maybe been tried six times like Curtis or more times. And we only found one case of someone who'd been tried more times. And I should say nobody tracks this, so it's very possible that there is somebody who's been tried more times who we don't know about. We looked at old newspaper coverage. We called lawyers in different states, but we only found one case, so it's a case in Clarksdale, Mississippi — so in the Mississippi Delta, not in Doug Evans' district — and it involves an alleged gang member who was accused of killing two people, and he was actually tried nine times.

Samara Freemark: That was very surprising when we found that.

Madeleine Baran: Yeah, except that it wasn't a case, we couldn't find the full record. But what was different about it, it wasn't very similar to Curtis's case because a lot of the reasons for the multiple trials had to do with things like — in the middle of the trial they find out all of a sudden the juror, there's a juror who knows something or all of a sudden they find out in the middle of trial that something else has happened that requires in the middle of a trial for a mistrial to be declared. They had a bunch of hung juries, I think. So there was that case.

Samara Freemark: But this is not a common thing.

Madeleine Baran: No.

Samara Freemark: It's a very rare thing. And then what about this question from Karen, you know, is there a limit to this? Is there a limit to how many times you can actually try someone, like a legal limit?

Madeleine Baran: No. So if you are acquitted of a crime, so if a jury finds you not guilty, then you cannot be tried again. But Curtis of course was never found not guilty. So either in four of the trials a jury found him guilty, and in two of them they couldn't reach a verdict.

Samara Freemark: So this case has been going on for six trials, over more than twenty years. And Curtis has had more than a dozen attorneys working on his case. And we've gotten a lot of questions about why we were able to find out some of this stuff that the defense team had not uncovered, despite working on the case for so many years. So this would be things like Odell Hallmon telling us that he lied on the stand when he said that Curtis confessed to him us, or the information we uncovered about Willie James Hemphill.

Madeleine Baran: Right, the possible alternate suspect.

Samara Freemark: Right

Madeleine Baran: So I don't know the answer to that question. I mean there are a lot of things that the defense did find out. And this is of course a sprawling investigation. But clearly there are things that we found out that the defense did not know. And I don't know why that would be. All I know is what we do in our jobs. And so I do know that when we were going out and talking to a lot of the witnesses who testified for the state at trial, that they told us "I've been approached by the defense before but I didn't want to talk to them." One of the advantages sometimes that we have as reporters is that we're not on a side. So when we talk to a witness it really doesn't matter to us whether they're pro state or pro defense. We just want to talk to them. And so I think that helped us in a way to talk to some of the witnesses. I think that maybe our approach to records was different, but I'm not positive of that. You know, our strategy for records tends to be "can we please just look at the records ourselves?" And not just that but "where do you keep your records?" You know, "yeah we're in the office and there's some filing

cabinets here and could we look at those, but is there any other place where you keep records?"

Samara Freemark: For example, an abandoned plastics factory or a closed jail maybe.

Madeleine Baran: Right. And can we go there?

Samara Freemark: Yeah.

Madeleine Baran: Because you know, so that is actually where we found a lot of the most important records in this case. So you know for example, the booking card that showed that Willie James Hemphill, this alternate suspect, was held in jail shortly after the murders at Tardy Furniture in Winona; or a lot of Odell Hallmon's criminal record. You know, and then there are some —. You know, I guess one area that I would really point out where I do not know why the defense didn't follow through and pursue this — and when I've talked to Curtis's lawyers at the time they also say that they do not know why they did not pursue this — is the case of Willie James Hemphill. So here's a guy who very early on when we were looking at the investigative file, and I was going through it and putting it in in order, there was this document that clearly stands out, which is, you know just one page, Willie James Hemphill, you know, saying I'm aware of my rights. I'm aware that anything could I say could be used against me. And I'm going to waive them. And it's a couple of days after the murders. And I wrote, you know, who is this? What is this? You know and so we spent a year on that question. And that I do not know why the defense did not pursue. It'll be interesting to see if that's something that his team pursues going forward though.

Samara Freemark: We've had a lot of people ask about that old plastics factory where we found that booking card for Willie James Hemphill, and I should say, if you haven't seen it yet, Madeleine actually made a video of the Corrugate factory which is on our website, and I would strongly suggest that you check it out because it is amazing. But yeah, we have had a lot of people ask, like, *what* is going on with record storage down there?

Madeleine Baran: Yeah so, it's definitely true that there were some documents stored in some strange places in this project. But to me as a reporter what stands out more is that the documents did exist. Because a lot of times, your worst scenario as a reporter is that the documents are gone. That someone threw them out, that x number of years have passed, they have you know a records retention schedule that says every seven years we toss everything. That is your worst fear. What was happening here is that these documents were being saved, which is not exactly what you hear when you hear this, you hear oh man these documents are in some wild places. But actually for us, it was like this is amazing - we go into this jail and there are the documents! And the sheriff of that county is nice enough to let us into that jail and let us be there as long as we needed to be. Same thing with so many of these other places. The other thing to keep in mind, is that obviously it would be ideal if these documents were all digitized and we could just go to a computer terminal and look them up. But the reality is that's not the case here, and that's not the case in most parts of the United States. Because it's so expensive.

So you have to decide what am I going to digitize and what am I not going to. It's understandable if you didn't have any money for digitizing, that you wouldn't somehow try to digitize booking cards from the mid 1980s. And so that I think is what we were encountering. And fortunately, we were able to find things. The exception to that was the plastics factory, the Corrugate factory, because there you saw that documents were being destroyed, by mice, and by water, by mold. And you know there is a person whose job is to take care of the records, who's the elected clerk, who let us in, knew the records were being stored there. He wasn't the person who put them there, that was the former clerk, but he's the elected clerk. Knows that they're there, he let us in, he saw the state of the documents, he has no plans to do anything about it.

Samara Freemark: Yeah. I have another question about the, another voicemail about some decisions from the defense. Here we go.

***Caller:** Hi. My name is Kat and I'm calling from Fairfield, Connecticut about the Curtis Flowers case. I was wondering why it was never requested by the defense lawyers for a change of venue for the trial. It seems like once the jury was so familiar with the case, that it would have compromised their objectivity. So I'm just curious if that ever came up and what were the results if it did. All right. Thanks. Great job. I enjoyed the season.*

Samara Freemark: I like there's, there's like a kid in the background of that call. That's great.

Madeleine Baran: Definitely appreciate that.

Samara Freemark: Yes.

Madeleine Baran: So what happened in Curtis's case is actually the first two trials were held in a different venue in different parts of Mississippi. One of those trials was held down like on the Gulf and the other was held like north of Winona, northeast in Tupelo. And so those were the first two trials. And it's, it's a definitely a question that the defense has to consider. So the risk of course of having the trial in Montgomery County in Winona is that everyone knows about this case. Not only that. I mean this is a town of 4000 people. So many people are connected in some way to the people who might testify in this case or to their family. So when you read the jury selection, for example, you see at a certain point they just say "OK raise your hand if you know this witness." And sometimes you know 30 hands would go up. And so it becomes much harder to find a jury who you believe, the courts believe can set aside whatever information they do know and be fair and impartial, which is what the court is considering. And so if you look at it that way it might suggest, Well yeah, the defense would always want to move to a different venue. On the other hand, the risk that you run as the defense asking to move to a different venue is that you don't get to pick where the trial is going to move. And so in Montgomery County it is only slightly majority white, and there are lots of places in Mississippi that are much whiter. And from the defense perspective they have historically believed that they have faced a very hard time getting a fair trial in front of an all-white or nearly all white jury. And when the trial was moved it was moved both times to a place that was much whiter demographically than Montgomery County. And so that's sort of the tradeoff that the defense makes.

Samara Freemark: And if you do look at the record of the past six trials, Curtis Flowers has actually been more successful in trials that have been held in Montgomery County. So he's had two hung juries in Montgomery County compared to the first two trials which are both convictions.

Madeleine Baran: Right. So yeah, I mean there is this question of which one is the better option? I mean I think that the other thing to consider that we didn't point out in the podcast but I think about sometimes is when Curtis's case was tried locally, to get down to 12 jurors they had to start with hundreds of potential jurors. So at this point there are so many people in that area who have been called to jury duty in this case and have gone through jury selection. So I don't even know about the chances of finding people who haven't gone through jury selection. And the other thing too that I think is interesting to think about with this is you know if you have a trial in a big city, like a high-profile trial, of course the jurors get scrutinized for their verdict. Especially if the public largely disagrees with the verdict. But it's not as personal.

Samara Freemark: Right.

Madeleine Baran: So in Winona, if you are one of the 12 jurors who find Curtis guilty or not guilty or can't decide, everyone knows that. You're going to be the juror that let Curtis go or the juror that made sure he was executed or the juror who couldn't make up their mind. And you know you're going to go to the bank and you're going to see someone related to one of the victim's families or you're going to go to the basketball game and you're going to see Curtis's family or whatever it is, And so I think that does make being a juror in this case really difficult because you are so public. And so that I think is another thing that I know just from talking to people in Winona has made some people sort of wary of wanting to be on this jury.

Samara Freemark: Of course. Yeah.

Madeleine Baran: Which is very understandable.

Samara Freemark: So, one person we've had a lot of questions about, you might not be surprised to hear, is the D.A. Doug Evans. The first thing people want to know is whether we've heard from him since the podcast has come out.

Madeleine Baran: We have not.

Samara Freemark: No. Which is, we'd be happy to talk to him.

Madeleine Baran: Yeah, I mean we would —. You know, I have reached out to him since the podcast has come out. We would still like to continue to talk with him. We did talk with him of course as people heard and we included that in the podcast, and especially going forward. You know, this is a case that is by no means over yet. And so as the elected district attorney he has still a lot of involvement in this case going forward. So I do hope that he continues to talk to the

public about the case, to explain some of his decisions in the case and we'll certainly continue to reach out to him and hope that he does talk to us again.

Samara Freemark: So I have a tweet here from — and I'm probably going to get this wrong, sorry — HeatherKatapple. Heatherkattapple tweeted: with multiple rulings of prosecutorial misconduct, how does Doug Evans remain assigned to subsequent trials?

Madeleine Baran: Yes, so Doug Evans really is his own boss, and so he doesn't even need to get assigned to a trial. So he just is the district attorney. And so. You know in the federal system for example, he would have a supervisor who might say to him, you know, you did a really good job, you know, I think you should try it again or want and try again or I don't think you should try it again. But Doug Evans, as a district attorney, as the top prosecutor in that area, gets to decide that. The court could say you are not allowed to try this case again or something along those lines. But that has not happened in this case. And not for lack of trying by the defense.

Samara Freemark: So Curtis's lawyers, have they tried to get him removed from the case?

Madeleine Baran: They have. They have tried to get him removed from the case. They've also tried more than once, to convince the court to not allow Doug Evans to have any peremptory strikes.

Samara Freemark: And this is in jury selection?

Madeleine Baran: Right. So you know, Curtis's defense have pointed to the record of Doug Evans using a lot of his strikes to remove black people from the jury pool and have said to the court, "look, in light of that Curtis can't get a fair trial unless you take away Doug Evans's ability to strike those jurors." The courts have disagreed with that and it's not a request that I am familiar with ever being upheld by a court or agreed to, just to point that out. But yeah I mean, of course, also Curtis' defense had tried to get the judge removed from the case. As we pointed out in the podcast, and the judge basically gets to decide: Should I remove myself from the case? And the judge had said I should not. And when the judge was considering, Judge Loper, whether to remove Doug Evans from the case at one point, he asked Doug Evans in court, "Is there any reason I should remove you from the case?" And Doug Evans said no. And so he then immediately decided in court, I'm not removing you from the case.

Samara Freemark: So of course, one way that Doug Evans would no longer be on this case is if he was no longer district attorney.

Madeleine Baran: Right.

Samara Freemark: So there have been questions about whether, does he have any plans to retire? Is anyone going to run against him? Do you know? Are you aware of either — anything on either of those fronts?

Madeleine Baran: So he's gonna be up for re-election in 2019, so next year. And so far, there's no indication that he is going to retire. I mean he's even given a public statement about it maybe a year or so ago saying that he has no plans to retire. And so, yeah, there's no indication that he's not going to run again. And of course, in the past, every time he's run, except for once, whenever he's run for re-election he's run unopposed. And so there's also, so far, no indication — no one stepped forward to say they're running against him. So we'll have to see what happens there. But for right now, yeah there's no indication that that anything will happen other than he'll run for re-election.

Samara Freemark: I have a [tweet from ShaunPConley](#). He writes: Do you expect Doug Evans to be reprimanded or punished in any way? He says the gentleman in charge of the bar complaints that was interviewed in the update podcast used the phrase "trust the process." But confidence in the process doesn't seem to work for Curtis.

Madeleine Baran: So the question right now is whether or not the bar association is looking at all at Doug Evans. And we do now know the answer to that question because we know now from one listener that has gone through now the process of filing a bar complaint against Doug Evans, which has not been decided on or ruled on in any way but has been filed. And the bar complaint process is somewhat, you know, it's not entirely public. The Bar Association does not comment on anything that they are currently investigating or even if they are currently investigating anything. But we do know — and we've seen documents from one listener who's filed a bar complaint — that one has been filed and that Doug Evans has responded to that bar complaint via a lawyer that he now has in Grenada, Mississippi. And so we will continue to monitor that. And so the Bar Association can take a couple of steps if it finds that a lawyer has engaged in conduct that is not allowed and one of them is a private reprimand where a lawyer basically gets a private letter from the bar association saying, "this is not allowed." He could be publicly reprimanded, a lawyer. That would perhaps look like a you know — even being called before a judge and being read a reprimand. It's very rare for a lawyer to be disbarred. So we'll just have to see what happens with that.

Samara Freemark: We have had people wonder as well if the feds would ever get involved. So if anyone's looking into the possibility that there may have been civil rights violations here that the federal government might take an interest in?

Madeleine Baran: Right, like we think about that, for example, when we think about Ferguson, where the federal government did intervene in Ferguson. There's no indication that that's happening here. So we did reach out to the Justice Department and we asked them "Are you looking at anything in Winona, Mississippi or in this judicial district?" And they responded and they said "we don't comment, we're not going to comment, basically we don't comment on that kind of thing." But there's no indication, just having been in Winona a lot since the podcast came out and talking to a lot of people there, that there is Justice Department involvement in the case.

Samara Freemark: So some people have written in and asked specifically about what's called a Brady violation, wondering why people aren't investigating Doug Evans for potential Brady

violations. So a Brady violation is when a prosecutor fails to turn over required material to the defense. And we talked about this in one of our episodes when we were talking about Willie James Hemphill.

Madeleine Baran: Right. So this is material that could tend to show that the defendant is not guilty.

Samara Freemark: Right.

Madeleine Baran: So very critical information. And so typically the way that this works is even if a court were to find that, yes, a prosecutor did not turn over Brady material, something they're required to turn over, that there's really no consequences for that outside of what happens in the courtroom in that particular case. And so the way that the system is setup right now, if you commit a Brady violation, what that means, often that the conviction gets overturned. And that's the consequence for that, which of course no prosecutor wants that. And so that is a consequence of a sort. But it is not something that then prohibits the prosecutor from continuing to try other cases. The thing I should point out about a Brady violation however is that, like we said earlier, all a Brady violation is the prosecutor has something that would tend to show that the defendant is innocent, and it hasn't been turned over to the defense. And it doesn't mean that the prosecutor is hiding information. The prosecutor doesn't have to hide that information.

Samara Freemark: I mean it can mean that, but it doesn't have to.

Madeleine Baran: Absolutely, it could be intentional — I know I'm sitting on DNA that shows that another person did it and I'm not turning it over. But it could also be, you know, in an office somewhere, there's some notebook there that's actually Brady material that should've been turned over. And even if I didn't know about it as the D.A., I'm still responsible for turning it over. But certainly when we talk about people who want certain changes in the criminal justice system we're talking about the Brady violations that seem more intentional, where someone has made a decision, which is a decision that they're not supposed to make, to sit on evidence that shows that someone else did it or shows that the person who is sitting in prison for the crime most likely did not do it. And that is a very serious issue and especially of course in death penalty cases.

***Caller:** Hello. My name is Thomas Cunningham, calling from California, and my question is whether or not you all have encountered during your reporting any official entity in Mississippi that has seemed at all sympathetic to the evidence and reporting that you've uncovered. Thank you.*

Madeleine Baran: Thanks for the question. I guess what I would say to that is the short answer to that is no. We do know however that the attorney general's office for the state of Mississippi, which is now representing the state in the appeal of Curtis Flowers, has been dismissive of

some of our findings — some of the findings that have been mentioned by the defense. Specifically, they have been very dismissive of the reporting about Willie James Hemphill.

Madeleine Baran: So they have said he was not an alternate suspect. Yes, he was in jail but he was not an alternate suspect in this case. And so that has really been the only official response so far. Other than of course the response in my interview with Doug Evans, where he also responded to, for example, Odell reversing himself.

Samara Freemark: We actually reached Odell Hallmon. reached him by Facebook and then later by phone. He's in Parchman Prison right now. He's serving three life sentences for murdering three people. And we were able to reach him on an illicit cell phone —.

Madeleine Baran: That he had.

Samara Freemark: That he had. And so we've gotten a lot of questions about this and people have wondered since the podcast aired, is Odell still on Facebook and does he still have that phone?

Madeleine Baran: I don't know if he still has the phone, but he is still on Facebook. And he's on Facebook under a fake name, which is what he's been on Facebook under for some time, but he's still on Facebook. A while ago I checked to see if he had posted or liked anything and he was still liking some stuff, so he's still on Facebook. And we contacted the prison —.

Samara Freemark: This is Parchman Prison.

Madeleine Baran: Right. Parchman Prison. We contacted the Mississippi Department of Corrections and asked a spokesperson for that department why Odell has a cell phone? What what is going on? I mean he's serving three consecutive life sentences for killing three people. And we also know that he has used Facebook to send messages to the victims' families, the people he killed, asking for money and contacting them in other ways. And they did not really provide any information. They did not provide any information. They said "we're not going to comment on that. We're not going to tell you whether or not we searched his cell following that," but all we do know is that somehow he's still on Facebook. And the reason why I point out the part about the victims' families is it's like prisoners sometimes have access to the Internet, you know. But that's not what we're talking about here. We're not talking about a sanctioned access to the Internet. We're talking about someone who is breaking the rules in prison, who's using the breaking of rules to contact victims' family members of the crime that he's in prison for, the murders, and the prison, whatever they're doing, they haven't stopped him from being on Facebook.

Samara Freemark: Okay, I have a totally different kind of question now. This is from Twitter from MJaquesLeslie:. They write: I would love to hear more about your personal and professional experiences as journalists reporting on this story. What made it different from other stories you've done? What made it similar? What was it like moving to Mississippi to report?

And then jurisdogtor writes: What was your favorite part of living in Winona? And this is my favorite question, were you known around town as the reporter woman?

Madeleine Baran: Yes, definitely true. Yeah, I mean both me and our producer Natalie were known I think as, you know, those two ladies from the radio, the people that are reporting on Curtis' case, those ladies from Minnesota. It was no secret obviously that we're in this town reporting and so--especially for that long. And I should say too that so many people in Winona were incredibly welcoming to us and really helpful as well in just practical things. You know, I'm trying to find where someone lives, and they actually live in like the third trailer behind a house somewhere and there's no actual address on that trailer. So really, we were helped a great deal by people in town and in that area, just giving us even the most basic information. And of course, we were there for so long that people knew us. I mean to the point where sometimes we would knock on someone's door and they'd come out and they'd say, "I was figuring at some point or another you'd try to knock on my door because you knocked on my cousin's door, my uncle's door my grandmother's door, my pastor's door, my best friend's door, my neighbor's doors on both sides. So here we are. And you know, also I think as a reporter one of the advantages to having this much time too is that, you know, it's not reasonable to show up and demand that people trust you. You need to earn people's trust. And sometimes what that looks like is — often what that looks like, I think, is putting in time. And so if you've talked to other people in someone's family, for example, or on their block, and those people say that went well, they seem like they're serious about their job, and they listened, then you know the next person might hear about that and feel "OK I know a little bit about this person. I'm a little more comfortable." Or even just seeing someone around. You know, we weren't from there but at the same time after a certain point it wasn't like we were strangers, that we're someone that people knew in the town, and a lot of this reporting too was done just by knocking on doors. In fact, that was largely how it was done. So we would get up in the morning, and we'd have a list of people, a long list that we're hoping to talk to and we would just start going down the list and going to people's houses, seeing who was home. And we'd just do that again the next day and the next day the next day.

***Caller:** Hello In the Dark. I just had a question about the fact that a lot of the people doing the interviewing on your podcast are women. And I was just wondering — as women interviewing men, did you feel that the men you interviewed were less likely to be confrontational or aggressive with you because you were women or the opposite? Did you ever feel concerned for your safety as women who were occasionally confronting or interviewing men who had a history sometimes of dangerous or violent behavior? Thanks very much for all of the work you do. This is Lindsay calling from Tokyo.*

Madeleine Baran: First of all, thank you for calling from Tokyo.

Samara Freemark: That's awesome.

Madeleine Baran: That's great. Yeah. You know to me I think of it more as —. As a female reporter I think in some ways there is an advantage because you don't seem threatening to

someone. And I think in general reporters should try to not seem threatening, you know. I think the best approach is a low key, non-confrontational approach, like treat people decently. And I do think if you treat people decently with respect, then you increase the chances that they will do the same, versus, if you go in, you know, I've got a list of questions and I'm here to demand answers and I'm not leaving. Well then it's reasonable to expect that people might not like that. I mean I wouldn't like that. I do think you know, I have been in past projects where it's definitely clear that people are sort of underestimating what might be happening because I was a female reporter. I think that though a lot of the concerns in this case would be the same, in terms of safety concerns. And I also would say too that there's a difference as well being a white reporter that we've thought about in a lot of these exchanges as well. So I think that all of the things about you impact the project for better or worse in different ways in the same project. And I didn't feel like the people we were talking to were less likely to be angry with me because I was a woman. I will say that. As is the case with strong emotions, sometimes people are just angry. But I do think that we reduce the chance of that, like I said, by just being reasonable.

Samara Freemark: And do you feel like —. I mean I think a lot about —. The nature of this reporting was so much about, like you were saying, just knocking on doors, just going up to someone's house who is not expecting you, carrying a very large microphone, like a very large microphone —.

Madeleine Baran: So large that people rightfully ask "is that a video camera?" Actually, it is just a microphone.

Samara Freemark: And I definitely think about how I would feel if I opened the door and there were two men standing there carrying all that gear wanting to talk to me, especially if it was, you know, after work 6:00 p.m., starting to get a little dark. I do think it may have —. It felt like sometimes an advantage for sure.

Madeleine Baran: Yeah definitely. And also when you add to that the fact that people have often seen us before we knock on their door. So you know it's like a combination of those things. I mean. So I think that's where I would—. I wouldn't say something like there's no way that a male reporter, an all-male team could do this work, I think that would be ridiculous to say that. But I think—. So I think it's a combination of things. And I think the most successful reporters who I really look up to really do try —. You want to put people at ease, like you are only there to try to figure out what happened, and so you think a lot about that. You know, if there is a reason why someone is really going to feel uncomfortable about you just showing up at their house because of some past experience, well you don't do that then. You try to think of a different way. you know you want to figure out well how can I show, not convince, but show this person that I'm going to be responsible. You know, do I need to send them links to my stories that I've done in the past? Do I need to have a person I've interviewed in the past call this person and explain what it was like to be interviewed? So you're always thinking about those things. One of the things I do feel is very, was so important for the story was that just for the reporting, that we did have the time that we had and that we lived in that area. Because I just do not think that the story could have been done thoroughly and responsibly without that

amount of time and without being in Mississippi. Just on a practical level, there's tons of people we would never been able to reach, we would have never gotten many documents. But just, you know, this is a complex story and it needs a lot of time going into it. We don't know what we don't know of course. We don't know what we're going to find. And so I'm just grateful that —. I mean it's very unusual to be able to have this much time or to be able to have a team of five people full time working on a project — one project for more than a year. So I think that hopefully when we show in the podcast a little bit of this, you know, when we show Parker scanning, scanning, scanning all these documents, people can get a sense of why investigative reporting takes time, and maybe why it's valuable, why it's something that people should really think about supporting. Because, you know, facts aren't cheap sometimes to come by. You know, some are, that's great but not always.

Samara Freemark: That's gonna be our new fundraising slogan, I like that.

Madeleine Baran: Facts aren't cheap.

Samara Freemark: Yeah, it's good.

Madeleine Baran: Okay, so Samara, I have a question for you.

Samara Freemark: Oh okay.

Madeleine Baran: We got a tweet from MS Becker SPPS, teacher. And she tweeted at us: because we are studying this podcast as a class — which by the way is great. And a number of people have done. So she says: because we are studying this podcast as a class, most of my questions are format related. How did you go about determining the structure? How did you decide what info stays in and what goes? Were there any assumptions that you had going in that proved false? So as a senior producer what would you say?

Samara Freemark: Oh man, so I think structure, it's like the hardest thing to do in a project like this. Like it is the thing that keeps me up at night. It is just the most intense intellectual exercise, because we reported this story for more than a year. So in the course of that year we generate so much material, you know, findings, documents, tape — hundreds of hours of tape, notes. And so we have to take all of this material and somehow turn it into a story that people want to listen to. And figuring out how we tell that story is really, really hard.

Madeleine Baran: Especially in this story, I think, where you have six of everything.

Samara Freemark: Six trials, four victims. It was a story that happened, that has happened over many, many years.

Madeleine Baran: Complicated too.

Samara Freemark: So complicated, you know, a lot of legal procedure. The facts of the case were very complicated. So it was just, it was a hard story to tell. And so I think for us, even from the beginning the reporting was always driven by a question. As investigative reporters that's what we're doing, we're trying to answer a question and the question for us was how was Curtis Flowers tried six times for the same crime. And that was the question that drove all of our reporting. And then when we got, when we took all that reporting we tried to turn it into a story, it was also the question that drove how we structured the story. So we took all this material that we had and we started trying to make sense of it. And so we were, you know, we put it on note cards. And we put those note cards up on the wall and we moved them around and we considered all these different ways to start and ways to end and what should go in and what should not go in. And to the question of what should go in and what gets cut, it really comes back to that question. Does this piece of information, does this story help to answer that question — how was Curtis Flowers tried six times for the crime? And if something doesn't answer that question, even if it's a really good anecdote or it's a really good scene or it's really great tape, it doesn't go in because it's not in service of that question.

Madeleine Baran: Right we're not —. I mean, we're not primarily storytellers, if we think about it, because then we could tell any kind of story. We're primarily journalists. So the story's got to serve the journalism in that way. I always think too about, because we are multiple episodes we have to think — and we've talked a lot about this — about what's the narrative arc for the whole story? But then what's the narrative arc for each episode? And so a lot of time we spent was, does this go in episode three? Is this an episode 5 thing? Well if it is then episode six is affected. Now it needs episode two. I mean it really is this moving thing, and it's, you make one decision and it requires changes, you know, even very far away from that one change.

Samara Freemark: It is such a brain puzzle. It really is. And yeah, there's some really great stuff that didn't make it in, you know, because it didn't answer the question or just because it didn't fit the structure.

Madeleine Baran: And also of course a really critical thing to talk about too is we're talking about four people shot in the head at their job. So right away the story is a story of death, murder, trauma, loss and then also for the perspective of Curtis's family. So you have a lot going on right to begin with and so you have a lot of decisions that you need to make about how to tell that part of the story responsibly and how to tell that part of the story. And so, yeah, I mean I think I'm grateful for our editor Catherine Winter who you never hear on the podcast, but you really do because her work is throughout, and it's a process of making many, many edits, going through it many times and usually ending up very far from where we started with the rough draft.

Samara Freemark: And then as far as this question of were there any assumptions we had going in that proved false? I mean I really think we try to start with no assumptions. You know, we want to go in really just curious and trying to figure out what happened. I don't think we —. I'm thinking back to when we started this reporting, we were just curious.

Madeleine Baran: Yeah, i'm trying to think of an assumption that we might have had, you know, as reporters we're actually probably the toughest on some things. I mean, for example, one of the things that we spent a lot of time looking for in the records and talking to people was: is there any evidence against Curtis, really damning evidence that for whatever reason was not admitted at trial? You know, but we look and look and look and we don't find any. So we don't even go —. We don't go in assuming that the court record is all of the evidence against Curtis. And also you know as reporters you're trained to be skeptical. And so even when you find something out, it doesn't mean you believe it. I mean like some people, a lot of people ask, you know, what are these moments like? Like what was it like when you found out this or you found out that and kind of thinking that's going to be a really dramatic moment? And often for us it is not.

Samara Freemark: Right.

Madeleine Baran: Because it is immediately followed by — like if I'm telling you something or you're telling me something, it is immediately followed by so many questions

Samara Freemark: It can be a little deflating at times. You think you've come up with something really big and you bring it to the rest of the team and they're like "But well?" And you're like "oh man."

Madeleine Baran: Like did you ask it this way? What did this other person say?

Samara Freemark: Could it mean this instead?

Madeleine Baran: Right. Could it mean something different? Well now you're going to need to talk to these 10 people. I can't think of a single moment that, of a finding that wasn't like that. I mean that's the job also of the whole team and the editors, is to be skeptical and to constantly be thinking, you know, what are we missing, what are we leaving out? What is the way in which all these facts add up to something different? That's really the behind the scenes work of reporting.

Samara Freemark: Yeah. So speaking of Curtis Flowers himself, we got a lot of questions about the fact that we couldn't talk to him.

Madeleine Baran: Mmhmm.

Samara Freemark: And one person wondered, Did the prison prevent you from talking to Mr. Flowers based on a request from his defense team?

Madeleine Baran: So the answer to that is no. The prison just denied it. And denied not only me visiting Curtis in prison but also me interviewing him on the phone.

Samara Freemark: Did they say why they were denying the request?

Madeleine Baran: No, and actually I brought the emails here so I could just be more precise about what this looked like, this exchange with the prison. So this is from February of 2018. And so I emailed the spokesperson for the Department of Corrections requesting an interview with Curtis Flowers and she wrote back and she said, and this is her email: Hi Madeline, your request to interview Flowers is not approved. My apology for the delayed response, because it had been some time. So I wrote back: Thank you for the reply. What is the reason my request was not approved? And then she wrote back to me just this one line, so this is the entirety of her email. She wrote quote. Hello. A reason was not provided. End quote. So that's it from the prison. And so once the prison denied a request both to interview Curtis in person or on the phone. We asked the defense if we could interview Curtis basically over letters. And they said no. We also found out from Curtis Flowers' family that the defense had instructed Curtis Flowers not to write back to us. So we have a combination here of the prison denying us access, the defense denying us access, and so we have this person at the center of our story who we cannot, so far, talk to, although I hope still one day to be able to speak with.

Samara Freemark: So here's an interesting question from Damien shields. If you weren't a reporter would you have been allowed to visit Curtis in prison? If so, could you send someone in undercover who is not known to a reporter but is well versed in this case and In the Dark to interview him?

Madeleine Baran: OK.

Samara Freemark: Let's take the first part of that question first.

Madeleine Baran: Yeah, so if you weren't a reporter would you been allowed to visit Curtis? Maybe. So the way that it works is that Curtis has a list of people that he puts on —this is the same for all prisoners. They put people on a list at Parchman Prison, and then if they're okay to visit there are certain restrictions. But in general, you know, Curtis puts people on a list. The Department of Corrections reviews that list and approves it and then those people can visit Curtis during visiting hours at Parchman Prison. So maybe. The answer to that is maybe that would have worked.

Samara Freemark: What about the second part about sending an undercover?

Madeleine Baran: No. We would never do that. So we do not engage in undercover reporting, so no.

Hi, this is Molly Hughes calling from Rochester, New York. First, I'd just like to say you guys are doing an amazing job, an incredible and courageous job with both, with both seasons of In the Dark, so thank you for that. Second, my question is regarding if Curtis Flowers — if the Supreme Court does rule to overturn his conviction, and if Curtis is released. Number one, would he returned to Winona and number two, if so, would he or should he have any fear for his personal safety if he returns? Thanks a lot, bye-bye.

Madeleine Baran: So I haven't talked to Curtis about this, so I don't know what he would say, but his family has told me, they don't think Curtis would return to Winona, MS. And the reason for that is they just don't think Curtis would be safe there. You know, in the podcast, we get into the fact that the family's house has already burned down once, during one of the, you know in the middle of the trials happening. And more than that though, everywhere I went in Winona, whether I was talking to white people who thought Curtis was guilty, or black people who thought he was innocent, everybody shared this one belief, which was that Curtis is not safe in Winona, Mississippi, because people would want to kill him if he was out. We also know that one of the victims' family members, the father, Randy Stewart, the father of Bobo Stewart, the youngest victim, had plotted to kill Curtis before, and told us that. One of the people who told me that Curtis wouldn't be safe there is the current elected constable, so a member of elected law enforcement, a guy named Jerry Bridges. Basically he said something like, well if he gets out, we'll have another murder. To him it's that certain. So it does not seem like a safe situation for Curtis. Of course, who knows if it would actually happen. But that is absolutely the feeling in Winona, it would not make any sense for him to stay there. On the other hand, that's where he's lived for most of his life, um, but yeah.

Samara Freemark: So a genre of messages that we've gotten a lot of have to do with people wanting to help Curtis and I'll play you just one example of this. Here we go.

***Caller:** what can we do to make sure that Curtis gets a fair trial? Who do we write a letter to? Where is our time best spent? I'm just wondering if you know where that energy should be channeled. Thanks so much.*

Madeleine Baran: So we've gotten this question a lot, these types of questions, and think it's important to point out that, you know, our job as reporters is to be reporters. And so we are not activists for one side or another. We're not involved in protests or anything like that. It's really important—the way that we look at our job—for a reporter to be independent. And so we report the facts. And what happens with those facts in a democracy after that, what people decide to do, what Doug Evans decides to do, what the defense, what people listening decide to do is up to those people to decide. So our role as reporters is really, as the gatherer of the facts and the person who put them into context — which is important — but is not the person then who takes the next step, whatever that next step might be. And I think —. I can't stress the importance of independence enough. You know, our job strongly depends on us showing up to a story and saying truthfully I don't care what the facts are. I don't need them to be this way or that way. I just want to know what they are. And the way that you get to that point and maintain that point is by truly separating yourself I think from that type of action. So when we get these questions I usually respond with some type of response like that. You know, it's our job to expose an injustice, everyone else's job is to figure out what to do with that, you know, is sort of a way to think about it.

Samara Freemark: Okay, so our last question comes from Brandon Irby. And he asks: Any leads for season 3?

Madeleine Baran: So we are starting to work on ideas for season 3. We haven't picked a story yet. And we will be working on that a lot, like trying to decide what story to do right now in the coming months. It's one of the biggest decisions, maybe the biggest decision that we make. And so we tend to spend a lot of time researching and reporting a couple of stories before we decide which one. So stay tuned. But we don't have a secret story idea that we're not telling you about that we're currently reporting.

Samara Freemark: And if you do have ideas for us you can send us tips at investigatethis@apmreports.org.

Madeleine Baran: And the other thing I guess I would add is as you can tell from Season Two, our reporting takes a lot of time. So please be patient and know that we're working to bring you Season Three.

Samara Freemark: Thanks everyone for sending in your questions and for listening to the podcast, we really, really appreciate it. We've just really loved hearing from you over the course of the podcast. Please stay in touch. And also don't forget to sign up for our email listserv if you want to hear all the latest news about the Curtis Flowers case, and just news about In the Dark and what we're up to.

Madeleine Baran: Definitely. Also we are continuing to post stuff to our website in thedarkpodcast.org. And right now, what we're putting up actually while we're recording this are all of the transcripts that our reporter Parker Yesko tracked down at all the courthouses in Mississippi. So all the raw material that made up our jury analysis and we'll also be posting updates about what's going on with Curtis in his case on our website. And there's also if you haven't checked it out, there's just a lot more information about Curtis' case, about juries, all kinds of things, photos and videos on our website which is thedarkpodcast.org

Music starts

Madeleine Baran: In the Dark is a nonprofit public radio podcast. And that means we are supported by you our listeners. Your donations are what helped us to report Curtis Flowers story and also whatever story we report next. So you can make a donation of any amount to help us fund this reporting by going to thedarkpodcast.org/donate. It's thedarkpodcast.org/donate. And if you've already helped us out in ways big or small, thank you so much. We could not do this without you.

Samara Freemark: Thank you.

Madeleine Baran: In the Dark is reported and produced by me, Madeleine Baran, Senior Producer Samara Freemark, producer Natalie Jablonski, associate producer Rehman Tungekar, reporters Parker Yesko and Will Craft. In the Dark is edited by Catherine Winter. Web

Editors are Dave Mann and Andy Kruse. The Editor-in-Chief of APM Reports is Chris Worthington. This episode was mixed by Johnny Vince Evans.